UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,748	04/16/2007	Nigel Richardson	042933/313264	7726
826 ALSTON & BI	7590 02/18/201 RD LLP	EXAMINER		
	ERICA PLAZA	DANIELS, ANTHONY J		
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000 CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		02/18/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/584,748 RICHARDS		AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
ANTHONY J. DANIELS	2622		

	ANTHONY J. DANIELS	2622	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 February 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropriat	e extension fee ate extension fee
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	than three months after the mailing dat	e of the final rejection, e	ven if timely filed,
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a compact of the production of the p	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		ne issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·	,	,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-18 and 20-22. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 		condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Sinh Tran/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2622	Anthony J. Daniels AU 2622		

Continuation of 11. Applicant's arguments regarding claim 1 and the Knighton et al. reference have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant reiterates the argument that Knighton's camera is not a mobile communication device. The examiner disagrees for the reasons mentioned in the previous Office Action. Applicant also argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize from the disclosure of paragraph [0048] that a mobile communication device is a mobile station that communicates with other devices. The examiner submits that one of ordinary skill in the art may recognize this definition of a mobile communication device, but there are other instances in the specification that discuss keys and input operators that inherently rely on communication between intra-station components. These two teachings create an ambiguity. Simply reciting "communication" should not import Applicant's preferred interpretation into the claims.

Applicant further argues that the examiner's interpretation of the claim limitation, "a body that is relatively elongate about a first axis", is erroneous due to Applicant's assertion that the word elongate be defined as having more length than width. The examiner disagrees with this assertion and submits that the body to which the examiner refers can at least be construed to be slender about the examiner's interpreted first axis. Furthermore, Random House Dictionary defines elongate as simply "extended". The lens housing of Knighton can also be seen to be extended about the exmainer's interpreted first axis. The word elongate is not strictly defined as having more length than width. Again, Applicant is selecting a preferred definition of the word elongate in order to overcome the examiner's rejection. The examiner suggest that claims be amended to more particularly define the aspects of the invention which have been discussed.

The examiner believes that all arguments have been addressed.